

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1-6 and 8-22 are pending, in which claim 7 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 10, 15, 20, and 21 are currently amended.

The Office Action mailed May 1, 2007 rejected claims 1-6, 9, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Torssen et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0156540), and claims 7, 8, 10-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Torssen et al.* in view of over *Sharon et al.* (US Pat. 6,836,658). Additionally, claims 1-9, 14, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claim 22 is allowed.

With respect to the indefiniteness rejection, Applicants note that the claimed feature of “the assigned satellite address” indeed has antecedent basis. Regarding claim 1, such basis is found in the step of “**assigning an address** conforming to a second communication protocol for a multicast group of satellite terminals **within the satellite network** to map to the network address” It is clear that the subsequent recitation of “the assigned satellite address” refers to this assignment of address. Similarly, for claim 20, proper antecedent basis can be found in the “means for **assigning an address** conforming to a second communication protocol for a multicast group of satellite terminals **within the satellite network** to map to the network address.” Hence, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection.


To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, 15, 20, and 21 to incorporate certain features found in allowable claim 22. Amended claim 1 now recites “selecting one of a plurality of distribution mechanisms for transport of dataflow over the satellite network to the assigned satellite address, wherein the selected distribution mechanism is switched to another one of the distribution mechanisms based on capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating satellite terminals.” Claim 10, as amended, recites “wherein transport of the dataflow over the satellite network is according to one of a plurality of distribution schemes, the one distribution scheme being switched to another one of the distribution schemes based on capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating satellite terminals.” Amended claim 15 recites “selectively switching to another distribution scheme that utilizes a broadcast beam according to predetermined criteria including

capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating terminals.” Claim 20 recites “means for selecting one of a plurality of distribution schemes for transport of dataflow over the satellite network to the assigned satellite address, wherein the selected distribution schemes is switched to another one of the distribution schemes based on capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating satellite terminals.” Lastly, claim 21 recites “means for selectively switching to another distribution scheme that utilizes a broadcast beam according to a plurality of criteria including capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating terminals.”

In view of the claim amendment, it is respectfully submitted that *Torssen et al.* and *Sharon et al.*, alone or in combination, fails to teach all features of the claims. For example, neither *Torssen et al.* nor *Sharon et al.* discloses a capability to switch distribution mechanism, much less “based on capacity of the satellite network and reachability of the participating satellite terminals.”

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (301) 601-7252 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig L. Plastrik  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41,254

Phouphanomketh Ditthavong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,658

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION  
Patent Docketing Administration  
P.O. Box 956  
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109  
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956